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This investigation sought to describe the organization, function, and scope of the internal public affairs program of Carswell Air Force Base, Texas. Data came from in-depth interviews, office files, and military publications.

The Carswell Air Force Base internal public affairs program appeared to be without direction and reactive in nature. Personnel had little or no formal journalism or public relations training and demonstrated only a vague awareness of the relationships between publics, tools, and activities.

Still, the job seemed to get done, although perhaps not as well or as efficiently as possible. This raises the question: Where does formal journalism or public relations training fit into the running of a public affairs/relations office?
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Employee relations needs to be a part of any effective public relations program, and there is little doubt that it is important in good management. As one author put it, "[I]t simply is not good business to take employees for granted."¹

One of the more important parts of employee relations is employee communications. Bertrand R. Canfield and H. Frazier Moore wrote, "Employee communications is the keystone of modern public relations programs."²

A great deal of research has been done on public relations in the military, and all of it seems to be based on the assumption that public relations principles developed in the civilian sector can be applied to military management. This seems to be a reasonable assumption, except when talking about employee relations.

Military personnel have a unique relationship with their employer, if for no other reason than the fact that Article 134 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice allows


the military to impose criminal penalties for any offense that imperils "good order and discipline" in the armed forces.\textsuperscript{3}

The United States Supreme Court upheld the article in 1974,\textsuperscript{4} in effect limiting the constitutional rights of military personnel.

The point is not whether this limitation on individual rights is justified, but rather that the restriction seems bound to create a unique employer-employee relationship, a relationship that may not be governed by the same principles found in civilian industry.

The military is concerned with good management and effective communications. All branches of the military have put considerable effort into their employee communications programs.

There was considerable emphasis on employee relations even before the end of the draft in 1973, and it would be reasonable to expect even greater emphasis with an all-volunteer force.

In 1965, Colonel Thomas P. Coleman, Strategic Air Command Director of Information, said, "In building a sturdy Information structure, the Internal area must be the foundation. When the troops are properly informed, they become

\textsuperscript{3}Milton C. Cummings, Jr. and David Wise, Democracy Under Pressure, 3rd ed. (New York, 1977), p. 496.

\textsuperscript{4}Ibid.
the base's most important tools, and if they are not well informed, the effectiveness of all other tools is proportionately reduced."^5

The Dartnell Public Relations Handbook says:

All branches of the armed forces have become highly sensitive to the needs of internal communications . . . Army, Navy, Air Force and Marine Corps newspapers and magazines are professionally done, easy to read, and dedicated to keeping "the troops" informed. Perhaps some of the greatest advances in training films have been made by the men and women in uniform. Even Hollywood has said so.

And yet, the impact of the all-volunteer force on employee relations in the military has been dealt with in only one study, "A Study of the Use of Command Information Program Media in Influencing the Soldier in the Modern Volunteer Army," by Claudia G. Ramsay.^7

The present study looked at the employee relations and internal communications efforts of the military through a case study of the Public Affairs Office at one installation, Carswell Air Force Base, Texas.

Any examination of military public relations programs must realize that the term "public relations" is not used by

---


^6Darrow, Forrestal, and Cookman, p. 261.

government public information activities, including those of
the military, because of congressional decree.

Carl F. Hawver wrote,

A 1913 law, still in effect, states that "No
money appropriated by any Act of Congress shall be
used for the compensation of any publicity expert,
unless specifically appropriated for that purpose." It is not surprising, therefore, that no government
employee carries a title that would suggest he is a
"publicity expert." 8

Several terms have been used since the establishment of
the government public information function, with each term
designed to describe what is essentially public relations
but without suggesting publicity or propaganda.

The term currently in use by the Air Force is "public
affairs" and that is the term used in the present study when
referring to the military public relations function.

This study sought to understand better the military
public relations function, in particular the employee re-
lations function, by examining the employee, or internal,
public relations program at Carswell Air Force Base, Texas.

Statement of the Problem

What is the organization, function, and scope of the
internal public affairs program of Carswell Air Force Base, Texas?

Purpose of the Study

The purposes of this study were

1. To detail the goals and objectives, both short-range and long-range, of the Carswell Air Force Base internal public affairs program;

2. To examine the organizational structure of the Carswell Air Force Base Public Affairs Office;

3. To determine the internal publics of Carswell Air Force Base;

4. To determine the internal public affairs practices of Carswell Air Force Base.

Questions

For the purposes of this study, the following questions were posed.

1. What are the goals and objectives, both short-range and long-range, of the Carswell Air Force Base internal public affairs program?

2. How is the Public Affairs Office at Carswell Air Force Base organized?

3. Who are the publics, specifically, the internal publics, of Carswell Air Force Base?

4. What forms of internal communications are utilized by the Carswell Air Force Base Public Affairs Office?

5. What special internal communications needs does the Air Force have that are different from the needs of civilian industry?
Related Studies

Both employee relations and employee communications are well represented in academic research. *Journalism Abstracts* lists 425 entries under Public Relations from 1963 to 1980. Of these, fourteen relate to employee relations, thirteen dealing specifically with some facet of employee communications.

There is, however, a dearth of studies on specific communications programs within the military. There are no studies of particular bases.

A review of *Public Relations Journal* from 1973 to 1980, of *Public Opinion Quarterly* from 1977 to 1981, of *Journalism Quarterly* from 1974 to 1980, and of *Public Relations Quarterly* from 1973 to 1979 produced several articles relevant to the present study but none specifically on employee relations or employee communications in the military.

The Defense Information School at Fort Benjamin Harrison, Indiana has a *Bibliography of Theses and Reports Related to Military Information Activities*. Volume VII, July 1979 lists fifty-nine entries under Public Relations, only one of which had any connection to employee relations, and none of which dealt with employee communications. Although there was some overlap between the Defense Information School bibliography and *Journalism Abstracts*, the number of studies contained in both sources was not extensive.
The Department of Defense is one of the largest organizations in this country, employing thousands of people and spending billions of dollars each year. It is incredible that any facet of it should have escaped close scrutiny.

The military has been the subject of much public relations research: Forty studies are listed in *Journalism Abstracts* from 1963 to 1980. However, employee relations were studied in only six of these. Of the six, four dealt with the Troop Information Program of the Army in rather broad terms, one dealt with the Air Force's Family Service Program, and one dealt with the USAF Hometown News Center.

The internal communications of the other branches of the military are similar to that of the Army, so the result of these six studies is that it is known how the military intends for employee communications to operate but not how those intentions translate into reality.

Although none of the studies, other than the four Army Troop Information Program studies, concerned internal communications, several dealt with the public information function on a broad level and included portions on internal communications.

In 1965, Billy Lee Baxter wrote a master's thesis on "The Strategic Air Command Base Director of Information:"

---

Moore and Canfield, p. 437.
The Man and His View of the Job," at the University of Iowa, in which he surveyed the base directors of information at all the Strategic Air Command (SAC) bases on how they viewed different parts of their jobs, including major problem areas and utilization of time.

Baxter identified the following internal communications tools: commander's call, base newspapers, radio and television stations, programs to orient newly arrived personnel and their families, information programs for wives, personal letters from commanders to parents of airmen and young officers, bulletin boards, and information centers.

He concluded, "[A] majority of SAC Base Directors of Information do not realize the key importance of the Internal Information part of their program."11

In 1976, Michael R. Gannon wrote a thesis on "Air Force Information Officers' Perception of Their Jobs," at the University of Utah. Gannon was concerned primarily with whether Air Force information officers viewed their jobs as high or low status, and how they perceived their promotion potential.

In 1965, Jack F. Tolbert addressed himself to criticism of the military public relations program. His thesis for

---

10 Baxter. 
11 Ibid., p. 66.
the University of Oklahoma, "An Evaluation of the Criticisms of the Military's Public Relations Program,"\textsuperscript{13} focused on the Air Force and included an outline and description of the structure of the Air Force's public relations program.

To find studies on internal communications, it is necessary to look at those done on civilian industry.

In 1971, Charles Edward Ditterline, Jr. wrote a master's thesis on "Developing Corporate Unity Through the Establishment of an Effective Employee Communications System,"\textsuperscript{14} at the University of Utah. Ditterline outlined the steps in setting up an employee communications system, identifying major considerations and problem areas. He included a list of obstacles to effective communications that was used in the present study to identify special needs and problems of the Air Force employee communications program.

In 1977, Betty J. Potthoff wrote a thesis on "Public Relations Practices of the Communications Services Department of Dallas Power & Light Company,"\textsuperscript{15} at North Texas State University. She examined the "organization, function, 


and scope of public relations activities in the Communications Services Department of Dallas Power & Light Company."

Potthoff's data were gathered from interviews with Dallas Power & Light personnel, company publications, and trade journals.

Justification

The military is big and has all the communications problems of civilian industry, as well as some unique problems. Its size exaggerates its problems and makes them all the more visible.

Solutions to those problems should offer valuable insight into the role and function of communication in management. This insight can prove valuable to both communications researchers and civilian industry, as well as to the military itself.

Further, it may lead to more precise definitions of the principles of public relations within the military.

Understanding just how the Air Force's employee relations program translates into actual practice could be of help to those trying to establish effective internal communications in large, complex organizations, either in the civilian realm or in other branches of the military.

Carswell Air Force Base was selected for study for the following reasons: (a) The Air Force is the newest branch of the military and has a reputation among its personnel for being modern and innovative; (b) the Air Force is believed
to have an effective employee relations program, including internal communications; (c) the author has background and interest in the Air Force; and (d) Carswell Air Force Base is geographically convenient.

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this study, the following definitions were established

Public Relations - "Activities designed to achieve the support and understanding of internal and external publics for the business or organization."\(^{16}\)

Internal Public or Employee Public - "The people working in an organization -- both the governors and the governed, the managers and the employees."\(^{17}\)

Employee Relations - The shortcut term used to describe the internal relationship between an organization and its internal public.

Employee Communications - "The utilization by managers of business and industry of written, visual, and oral techniques to interpret their institutional actions and intentions to employees."\(^{18}\)

\(^{16}\) Baxter, p. 23.


Public Affairs - The field of public relations as practiced within the United States Air Force.

Public Information - The providing of facts and official policy statements on matters of interest to the general public, either in response to inquiries or in anticipation of questions.

Limitations of the Study
This study was limited to the activities of one military installation, Carswell Air Force Base, Texas, and to the internal public affairs activities conducted by the Carswell Public Affairs Office. It provides, as background, information about the total public affairs effort of the Air Force and the Carswell Public Affairs Office.

Assumptions
For the purpose of this study, the following assumptions were made.

1. The military has special communications needs and problems not shared with civilian industry. For example, the military needs to explain why employees may be asked to die doing their jobs at the same time they are paid less than their civilian counterparts.

2. Enough similar communications needs and problems exist between the military and civilian industry for meaningful comparisons. Military members are not always in an immediate combat situation, and during peacetime the
military has the same problems as civilian industry in terms of explaining new policies, sharing accomplishments of organizations and individuals, and telling the "company story."

3. Carswell is typical of military installations in the functioning of its Public Affairs Office.

4. Information gained from the study of military public affairs programs has broad implications and application. The information can help to clarify public relations principles by showing where those principles do and do not apply to the military situation.

Methodology

Information for this study was obtained from public relations textbooks, personal interviews with personnel in the Carswell Air Force Base Public Affairs Office, Air Force regulations and other Air Force material, and materials produced by the Carswell Air Force Base Public Affairs Office.

Public relations textbooks were used to identify basic concepts, definitions, and principles of public relations.

Personal interviews were used to obtain two kinds of information: (a) information about the organization and structure and activities of the Carswell Air Force Base Public Affairs Office; and (b) an understanding of the degree of familiarity with public relations concepts, definitions, and principles of the personnel assigned to the Carswell Air Force Base Public Affairs Office.
This study used Air Force regulations and other Air Force material to identify Air Force goals and objectives for its public affairs programs.

Organization of Thesis

Chapter I presents the introduction; Chapter II presents a brief history of public relations in the Air Force and at Carswell Air Force Base; Chapter III describes the organization and activities of the Public Affairs Office and the internal communication program at Carswell Air Force Base; and Chapter IV presents the summary and conclusions.

See Appendix A for the complete text of the Uniform Code of Military Justice Article 134 and Appendices B and C for the interview questions.
CHAPTER II

HISTORY OF PUBLIC RELATIONS IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

The public information function has always been with the American military, in one form or another, but much of it has been informal or done by the news media rather than the military itself.

As Moore and Canfield describe the history of the American military public information function, the first instance of army commanders making war news available to the public occurred in Cuba during the Spanish-American War.\(^1\)

Both the Army and Marine Corps had a public information function during World War I.\(^2\)

Moore and Canfield continue that, after World War I, the Air Service, predecessor of today's Air Force, established a public information service under the direction of Major Henry H. Arnold, chief of the Information Division in the Office of the Chief of Air Service. His skilled public information program contributed to the organization of a separate Air Force in 1947.\(^3\)

---


\(^2\) Ibid.

\(^3\) Ibid.
From this it is clear that the public information function of the Air Force has its roots in the Army but was officially born in 1947 when a separate Air Force was created.

Organization Of Air Force Public Affairs

Moore and Canfield summarize the present Air Force public information program,

The public relations of the Air Force is the responsibility of the Office of Information of the Office of the Secretary of the Air Force. The Air Force, like the Army, formerly combined internal and public information. Now the Air Force has an internal information division and a separate public information division in the Office of Information of the Air Force.4

In July 1979, the name of the information function of the Air Force was changed to Public Affairs.5

The fact that the Air Force places great emphasis on the information function is evident by the position of the Director of Public Affairs for the Air Force. He heads a staff agency of the Office of the Secretary of the Air Force; he also occupies a dual position as public affairs advisor to the Chief of Staff. As functional manager of the Air Force Information Program, he is directly responsible to the Secretary of the Air Force.6 (See Appendix D for organizational chart.)

4Ibid., p. 429.
5Interview with Major James B. Odom, Director of Public Affairs, Carswell Air Force Base, Texas, June 4, 1980.
6Moore and Canfield, pp. 433-434.
The Air Force's public affairs office is organized in three major divisions and two special offices: Community Relations, Internal Information, and Public Information Divisions and the Office for Resources and Projects and the Office for Security Review.\(^7\)

Moore and Canfield describe each of these divisions and special offices, but only the Internal Information Division description is included here. Moore and Canfield describe the Internal Information Division as being responsible for developing and conducting programs to increase the effectiveness of Air Force personnel by providing each member with information needed to understand better the Air Force and his/her role in it. The Division supervises the Commander's Call Program, including development of themes and production of film, slide, print, and recorded support materials. Its staff selects topics and monitors production of the monthly film "Air Force Now." It also supervises the Base Newspaper Program. It is responsible for publication of Airman magazine and the Air Force Policy Letter for Commanders and its supplement. It is the Air Force point of contact with the Defense Department for all Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) produced or procured information materials and American Forces Radio and Television operations. Its programs are designed to reach members of the Air National Guard, Air Force Reserve, Officers Training Corps, and civilian Air Force dependents, as well as members of the active force.

History Of Carswell Air Force Base

In a letter to the director of information at 2nd Air Force, Barksdale Air Force Base, Louisiana, in 1963, Captain Hubert C. Moore, information officer at Carswell Air Force

\(^7\)Ibid., p. 434.

\(^8\)Ibid., pp. 434-435.
Base, described how Carswell got its beginnings through the efforts of Fort Worth civic groups. Captain Moore wrote:

The history of Carswell started in the spring of 1940 when the Chamber of Commerce and other civic groups of Fort Worth began a movement to attract new manufacturing facilities. American industrial concerns were in the midst of a defense-era expansion program in compliance with a request from President Roosevelt. The industries were seeking sites for new plants inland from the 200-mile-wide safety zone around the coasts and borders of the country. The Chamber of Commerce contracted various aircraft companies, concerning available sites in the Fort Worth area.

The construction of a plant to build B-24 bombers was begun in April 1941, and a contract was awarded for the construction of the landing field, which was designated the Tarrant Field Airdrome.  

Captain Moore continued:

During the later part of 1941 negotiations between the Chamber of Commerce and the Army Air Force opened for an AAF training base when the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor on 7 December 1941. The attack on Pearl Harbor forced a speedy decision and Fort Worth was to have an Air Base, to be constructed on the East Side of Tarrant Field Airdrome. The construction of the base was authorized on 7 January 1942 and on 28 June 1942, Tarrant Field Airdrome was assigned to the Army Air Forces Flying Training Command and placed under the jurisdiction of the Commanding General, Gulf Coast Army Air Forces Training Command, on 25 July 1942.  

---


10 Ibid.

11 Ibid.
The Tarrant Field Airdrome was renamed the Fort Worth Army Air Field in May 1943. The name was changed to Griffiss Air Base on January 13, 1948 in honor of Lieutenant Townsend Griffiss. On January 30, 1948, the base was renamed Carswell Air Force Base in honor of Major Horace J. Carswell, Jr., of Fort Worth.12

Histories of the Fort Worth Army Air Field indicate that a public relations office was established in August 1942. The history of the 7th Bombardment Wing mentions a Public Information Office at the Fort Worth Army Air Field in November 1947.13 From this, it seems safe to say that the public information function has been with Carswell Air Force Base from its earliest beginnings.

Organization of Carswell Air Force Base
Public Affairs Office

Organization of the Carswell Air Force Base Public Affairs Office is analogous to Air Force public affairs organization.

The 7th Bombardment Wing is the host unit at Carswell. The director of public affairs is equal with the base

12 Ibid., pp. 2-3.

commander in that both work directly for the wing commander.\textsuperscript{14} (See Appendix E for organizational chart.)

The director of public affairs is responsible for the internal information, community relations, and public information programs at Carswell. He advises the wing commander on public affairs matters.\textsuperscript{15}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{14}Odom.
\item \textsuperscript{15}Ibid.
\end{itemize}
CHAPTER III

ORGANIZATION AND ACTIVITIES

All five of the personnel assigned to the Carswell Air Force Base Public Affairs Office were interviewed, each interview taking approximately two and one-half hours.

Each interview consisted of seventy-eight questions and a twenty-eight-question questionnaire. The questions were designed for four purposes: (a) to obtain personal data for a profile of the people assigned to the Carswell Air Force Base Public Affairs Office; (b) to obtain data on the organization and activities of the Carswell Air Force Base Public Affairs Office; (c) to indicate the degree of awareness of the Carswell public affairs personnel of the activities of the office outside their immediate work assignments, their understanding of general public relations and military public relations problems of the Air Force as well as of Carswell Air Force Base; and (d) to identify public relations problems of the Air Force and of Carswell Air Force Base.

Some of the questions overlapped, i.e., some questions gave data for more than one of the above areas, but most fell clearly within one area.
Profile Of Carswell Public Affairs Personnel

The Carswell Air Force Base Public Affairs Office has eight personnel positions: one major, one captain, one master sergeant, two staff sergeants, and three lower-ranking airmen.¹

Five of the positions are filled; the other three positions are unfilled. The people assigned to the Carswell Air Force Base Public Affairs Office are: Major James B. Odom, Staff Sergeant Robert E. Callaway, Staff Sergeant Charles D. Jones, Sergeant Gary E. Cunningham, and Sergeant Luis Acuña. Acuña is an administrative specialist (similar to a clerk typist) and is not involved directly with public affairs.²

The profile of the Carswell public affairs personnel shows no particular trend, but rather a heterogeneous mixture of experience, education, age, and background. No women are assigned to the Carswell Air Force Base Public Affairs Office. The typical member of the public affairs office at Carswell might be described as a noncommissioned officer, thirty-one years old, born in the South, married, with fourteen years education, four years in the military, two years at Carswell, six years in public affairs work in the military, little study or civilian experience in public affairs work, and intending to remain in public affairs in the Air Force.

¹Interview with Major James B. Odom, June 4, 1980.
²Ibid.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Staff Sergeant</th>
<th>Staff Sergeant</th>
<th>Sergeant</th>
<th>Sergeant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of Birth</td>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>married</td>
<td>married</td>
<td>married</td>
<td>married</td>
<td>single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (level/years)</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13½</td>
<td>13½</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Journalism (hours)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Journalism</td>
<td>Information Officer Course</td>
<td>a) Editor's Course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) CDC* Journalism upgrade (correspondence course)</td>
<td>a) DINFOS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizations</td>
<td>a) Officer's Club</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) church</td>
<td>NCO Club</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in Air Force</td>
<td>18 1/2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10 1/2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time at Carlswell</td>
<td>6 yrs.</td>
<td>18 mos.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18 mos.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Title</td>
<td>Chief of Public Affairs</td>
<td>NCOIC of Public Affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a) Editor, Carswell Sentinel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b) NCOIC, Internal Affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assistant Editor, Carswell Sentinel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Administrative Specialist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*CDC* indicates the Center for Disease Control.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time in Public Affairs (yrs.)</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>$7\frac{1}{2}$</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>none</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other Field</td>
<td>missiles</td>
<td>a) airborne cameras</td>
<td>administration</td>
<td>aircraft maintenance</td>
<td>administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b) flight simulator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time in Other Field</td>
<td>$3\frac{1}{2}$</td>
<td>a) $7\frac{1}{2}$</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b) $1\frac{1}{2}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like to Remain in PA?</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of Separation</td>
<td>undecided</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>1984</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE I (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civilian Journalism Experience</th>
<th>2(\frac{2}{3}) yrs.</th>
<th>none</th>
<th>none</th>
<th>none</th>
<th>none</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awards</td>
<td>a) two Air Force Commendation Medals</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>second place for SAC in photography</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Joint Services Commendation Medal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Meritorious Service Medal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*CDC - Career Development Course; a correspondence course of job-related material offered by the Air Force.*
Table I shows a moderately experienced staff, with little formal journalism or public relations training. Three of the five Carswell public affairs personnel are midway through their careers, one is near the end, and one is at the beginning. Two, the chief or public affairs and the editor of the base newspaper, have had significant public affairs experience.

All the Carswell public affairs personnel are high school graduates and four of the five have had some college. Two of the four with some college have their college training in journalism. Two of the five have no journalism training, either civilian or military, but one of them is the administrative specialist. Four of the five have indicated that they intend to make the Air Force a career, three in the public affairs field.

Only one of the Carswell public affairs personnel belongs to a nonmilitary organization, and none of them belongs to any professional journalism or public relations organization. Only one has any civilian journalism or public relations experience. Two have received military awards for their public affairs work. None has received any civilian awards.

Organization Of Carswell Public Affairs Office

The Carswell Air Force Base Public Affairs Office is divided into three functional areas: community relations, public information, and internal information.
Community relations includes "planning, conducting, and evaluating programs and actions that integrate Air Force people into community life. An effective community relations program creates mutual acceptance, respect, appreciation, and cooperation between the Air Force and the community."³

Public information involves "collecting, analyzing, and disseminating to the public and news media unclassified, releasable written and audio-visual information about the Air Force and its activities."⁴

Air Force Regulation 190-1 (the source for the above statements about community relations and public information) states that the internal information program is designed to

(1) Keep Air Force people informed about Air Force missions, and about Air Force, Department of Defense (DOD), and national policies decisions, and actions that are of interest to all Air Force personnel.

(2) Stress the importance of individuals as the primary instruments of aerospace power and emphasize their responsibilities as Air Force members.

(3) Develop an awareness in all Air Force members of their responsibilities as United States citizens.

Internal information is designed "to keep personnel fully informed so that the end result is high morale, higher

³Air Force Regulation 190-1, 1-4c, February 16, 1982.
⁴Ibid., 1-4b.
⁵Ibid., 1-4a(1)-(3).
productivity, and retention.\textsuperscript{6} Air Force Regulation 190-1 lists eleven specific objectives of the internal information program. The objectives are as follows:

a. Develop a greater awareness among Air Force members and their families of the Air Force's role in the United States' defense and of the individual's role in the Air Force.

b. Give Air Force members and their families accurate information about environment, pay, housing, personnel policies, and other issues that affect their morale, welfare, health, and safety.

c. Promote good citizenship and build pride in members of the civilian community at home and in foreign countries.

d. Credit Air Force people for outstanding accomplishments.

e. Support official fund raising activities.

f. Foster Department of Defense (DOD) human relations goals.

g. Promulgate basic doctrine of the United States, and promote a personal dedication to duty and pride in country.

h. Identify potential adversaries and explain their ideologies.

i. Explain the military capabilities of allied nations.

j. Inform Air Force personnel about defense matters so that they in turn can correctly inform members of the community when defense questions arise.

k. Respond to the internal aspects of the overall base public affairs plan.

\textsuperscript{6}Ibid., 2-1.

\textsuperscript{7}Ibid., 2-2a-k.
During the interview, each of the Carswell public affairs personnel was asked: "What do you see as the functions of the Air Force internal public affairs program? (For example, keep the troops happy, socialize troops into the military, etc.)" and "What are the goals and objectives, both short-range and long-range, of Carswell's Public Affairs Office."

These questions had two purposes: to identify the short-range and long-range goals and objectives of the Carswell Air Force Base Public Affairs Office, and to get an indication of the degree of awareness of those goals and objectives by the Carswell public affairs personnel.

Four of the five people interviewed selected "informing the troops" as the main function of the Air Force internal public affairs program. Various phrasing was used, but all four answers were consistent with the phrasing used in AFR 190-1. The fifth person in the Carswell Air Force Base Public Affairs Office selected "trying to keep the people happy" as the main function of the Air Force internal public affairs program.

The responses concerning the short-range and long-range goals and objectives of the Carswell Air Force Base Public Affairs Office were more varied. The director of public affairs listed some of the short-range goals as five news releases per month; five speeches about the command, about the Air Force, in the local community per month; six base
tours per month; and one squadron open house per year, per squadron.8

The director indicated long-range goals as "to be able to have the office function without me," "to eliminate the discontent of the civilian populace [about] the noise from Carswell."9

Responses from the other people in the Carswell Air Force Base Public Affairs Office included: Callaway, "to maintain a good relationship with the civilian public, as well as to inform the people in the military what's going on in the Air Force;"10 Jones, education and training of both internal and external populace of the base, "to have total cooperation throughout the base, total understanding within the community outside the base;"11 Cunningham,

[short-range] serve in an advisory capacity to the wing commander and other military people on base, and seeing that their dealings with the public or political figures are done so that no discredit or nothing bad happens to make the Air Force look bad, as well as to try to keep the members assigned to the base educated and informed as to what's going on in the world around them, military-wise.

8 Odom.
9 Ibid.
10 Interview with Staff Sergeant Robert E. Callaway, June 4, 1980.
11 Interview with Staff Sergeant Charles D. Jones, May 23, 1980.
[long-range] to work constantly at building as good a relationship as possible with the people downtown. and Acuña, "I don't really know if we have any long-range goals. Usually our short-range goals are like putting out the paper every week, putting out our monthly reports, general stuff like that."  

These responses seem to indicate only a vague awareness of the Carswell Air Force Base Public Affairs Office's goals and objectives. They indicate a lack of direction beyond day-to-day tasks, with little or no planning, either short-range or long-range. It is as though the regulations have been learned but not internalized into meaningful concepts.  

There seemed to be general agreement that the objective of the internal public affairs program was to "inform the troops," but there seemed to be little incorporation of "informing the troops" into individual perceptions of the goals of the office. Even the quota-type goals listed by the director seemed to be aimed at the community rather than at the base populace.  

This lack of understanding of stated goals was reflected in responses concerning the publics of Carswell Air Force Base. The respondents didn't seem to understand that their

12 Interview with Sergeant Gary E. Cunningham, June 6, 1980.  
13 Interview with Sergeant Luis Acuña, May 23, 1980.
efforts should be geared to particular groups of people, although they did seem to understand that there were different groups.

Publics Of Carswell Public Affairs Office

Each person interviewed was given two lists, one of external publics and one of internal publics, derived from various public relations textbooks and was asked to indicate with which ones the Carswell Air Force Base Public Affairs Office deals.

Each of the proposed external publics was perceived by at least one of the Carswell public affairs personnel as being a public with which the Carswell Air Force Base Public Affairs Office deals. Those publics were constituent, employees, owners, customers, community, educators, government, suppliers, dealers or distributors, competitors, groups promoting themselves, groups set up to impact things in the public eye, mass media, and other.

All five respondents listed these external publics as those with which the public affairs office deals: constituent, employee, owners, customers, community, city government, other government, groups promoting themselves, groups set up to impact things in the public eye, and mass media. Four listed educators and federal government. Three listed state government, and two listed suppliers, dealers or distributors, competitors, and others not listed.
### TABLE II

**PUBLICS AS PERCEIVED BY CARSWELL PUBLIC AFFAIRS PERSONNEL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constituent (noncommercial organizations)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owners</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customers</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educators</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suppliers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealers or Distributors</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitors</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups promoting themselves</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups set up to impact things in the public eye</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Media</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A = Odom   B = Callaway   C = Jones   D = Cunningham
E = Acuña
All of the external publics proposed were indicated by at least two of the Carswell public affairs personnel. However, there were different interpretations of exactly who was included in each public.

Jones defined "competitor" as all local employers vying for manpower; Cunningham defined it to mean other branches of the military. Of the three people who did not indicate competitors, one saw the competition as only other base newspapers. The other two did not specify who they viewed as competitors.

This difference in interpretation of particular publics may have had as much to do with differences in responses as any actual difference in understanding of the groups with which the Carswell Public Affairs Office deals.

Since identifying publics is at the heart of planned public relations, further clarification of the understanding of publics by the Carswell public affairs personnel was sought through questions about the base's internal publics.

The only internal public perceived by all of the personnel in the Carswell Public Affairs Office as "telephone operators." Four of the respondents listed receptionists and guards, correspondents, supervisors and foremen, and managers and executives. Three listed service people. Two listed salespeople. One listed purchasing agents and others not listed, with others specified as regular employees, that is, lower-ranking airmen.
Again, there seemed to be a great deal of difference in interpretations of who was included in each public. Jones and Cunningham defined "correspondents" as the mass media, while Callaway defined them as people who write letters to the Public Affairs Office. Acuña listed correspondents but did not elaborate on whom he was including in that public.

There ought to be a logical chain of thought linking publics, tools, and activities. That is, a person should be
able to tell himself, "These are the publics we need to reach and these are the tools available to us. Using this set of tools, we can do these activities to reach this public. To reach this other public, we will need to use these other tools and activities."\textsuperscript{14}

Tables II and III suggest that there is no clear perception by the Carswell public affairs personnel of just who their publics are, either external or internal. With little understanding of whom they are trying to reach, the Carswell public affairs personnel can hardly be expected to target their messages or activities. And with little agreement on who might be included in a particular group to be addressed, there can hardly be a unified team effort in any particular activity attempted.

This suggests that the Carswell public affairs personnel are task-oriented and do not conceptualize an overall program. This could lead to the production of the base newspaper or the conducting of base tours or the performing of any other activity as a goal itself, rather than a means to accomplish a goal.

This observation was further reflected in answers to questions about public affairs tools.

\textsuperscript{14} Derived from Bernard Berelson's theory that "Some kinds of communication on some kinds of issues, brought to the attention of some kinds of people under some kinds of conditions, have some kinds of effects." Found in "Communications," in Mass Communications, ed. Wilbur Schramm (Urbana, University of Illinois Press, 1949), p. 500.
Tools Of Carswell Public Affairs Office

A list of possible public relations tools was derived from public relations textbooks. This list was given to each person during his interview and was used to help answer two questions.

The first question was, "For each of the three areas mentioned (community relations, internal information, public information), what do you consider to be Carswell's three most important information tools? Please indicate in order of importance and include your reasons."

The second question was, "What other tools does the Carswell Public Affairs Office use on a regular basis?"

The three most important community relations tools perceived by Odom were personal contact with military and civilians, base tours, and open houses. The three most important community relations tools perceived by Callaway were open houses, speakers, and base-community council. The three most important community relations tools perceived by Jones were base-community council, open houses, and money base pumps into the community. The three most important community relations tools perceived by Cunningham were tour program, open houses, and Air Power Council. The three most important community relations tools perceived by Acuña were mass media (radio and television), base tours, and open houses.
The three most important internal information tools perceived by Odom were base newspaper, commander's call, and base guides and yearbooks. The three most important internal information tools perceived by Callaway were base newspaper, commander's call, and open houses. The three most important internal information tools perceived by Jones were base newspaper, commander's call, and squadron public affairs representatives. The three most important internal information tools perceived by Cunningham were base newspaper, commander's call, and programs orienting newly arrived personnel. The three most important internal information tools perceived by Acuña were base newspaper, commander's call, and commander's support.

The three most important public information tools perceived by Odom were mass media (print and radio/television), base-community council, and Air Force special interest groups (Fort Worth Air Power Council; Air Force Association). The three most important public information tools perceived by Callaway were radio and television, open houses, and information staff. The three most important public information tools perceived by Jones were hometown news releases, mass media, and personal letters from commanders. The three most important public information tools perceived by Cunningham were speakers, radio and television stations, and money the base pumps into the community. The two most important public information tools perceived by Acuña were
mass media and telephone. Acuña did not indicate a third tool in response to the question about most important tools.

There was unanimous agreement that the base newspaper was the single most important internal information tool and that commander's call was the second most important internal information tool. No other tools were given identical ranking by all the Carswell public affairs personnel.

Other tools used on a regular basis by the Carswell Public Affairs Office, as perceived by the Carswell public affairs personnel are shown in Table V. Those tools were information program for wives, bulletin boards, information center, staff meetings, press club, cooperation from wing personnel, briefings, grapevine, reading racks, posters, briefing materials, cameras, special projects, Airman magazine, policy letters, pamphlets, fact sheets, lithograph series, question-and-answer sessions about the Air Force, daily news digest, and marquee at front gate.

Clippings and a futures book are conspicuous in their absence from the list of public affairs tools indicated by the Carswell public affairs personnel. That is, although both exist in some form in the Carswell Public Affairs Office, neither was listed as a tool by any of the public affairs personnel.

The clippings file of the Carswell Public Affairs Office consists of articles about the base. The file is
TABLE IV

INFORMATION TOOLS AS RANK-ORDERED BY
CARSWELL PUBLIC AFFAIRS PERSONNEL

For each of the three areas mentioned in question 53, what do you consider to be Carswell's three (3) most important information tools? (Question 54)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERSONNEL</th>
<th>COMMUNITY RELATIONS</th>
<th>INTERNAL INFORMATION</th>
<th>PUBLIC INFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ODOM</td>
<td>1. personal contact with military and civilians</td>
<td>1. base newspaper</td>
<td>1. mass media (print and radio/television)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. base tours</td>
<td>2. commander's call</td>
<td>2. base community council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. open house</td>
<td>3. base guides and yearbooks</td>
<td>3. Air Force special interest groups (Fort Worth Air Power Council; Air Force Association)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COMMUNITY RELATIONS</td>
<td>INTERNAL INFORMATION</td>
<td>PUBLIC INFORMATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALLAWAY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. open house</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. base newspaper</td>
<td>1. radio and television</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. speakers</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. commander's call</td>
<td>2. open houses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. base-community council</td>
<td></td>
<td>3. open houses</td>
<td>3. information staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JONES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. base-community council</td>
<td>1. base newspaper</td>
<td>1. hometown news releases</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. open house</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. commander's call</td>
<td>2. mass media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. money the base pumps into the community</td>
<td>3. squadron public affairs representatives</td>
<td>3. personal letters from commanders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COMMUNITY RELATIONS</td>
<td>INTERNAL INFORMATION</td>
<td>PUBLIC INFORMATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUNNINGHAM</td>
<td>1. tour program</td>
<td>1. base newspaper</td>
<td>1. speakers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. open houses</td>
<td>2. commander's call</td>
<td>2. radio and television</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Air Power Council</td>
<td>3. programs orienting newly arrived personnel</td>
<td>3. money the base pumps into the the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACUÑA</td>
<td>1. mass media (radio and television)*</td>
<td>1. base newspaper</td>
<td>1. mass media*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. base tours</td>
<td>2. commander's call</td>
<td>2. telephone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. open houses</td>
<td>3. commander's support</td>
<td>3. none</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mass media (intended to mean print media) and radio and television stations, were listed as two items. Acuña indicated mass media as the number one tool for community relations, then went on to specify radio and television.
TABLE V
PUBLIC AFFAIRS TOOLS AS PERCEIVED BY
CARSWELL PUBLIC AFFAIRS PERSONNEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tool</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base newspaper</td>
<td>I*</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass media</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C/P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commander's call</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base-community council</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base tours</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open houses</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>I/C/P</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commander's support</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal contacts with military and civilians</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speakers</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs orienting newly arrived personnel and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their families</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information program for wives</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal letters from commanders to parents of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>airmen and young officers</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulletin boards</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information center</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information staff</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squadron information officers</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff meetings</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press club</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation from wing personnel</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briefings</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grapevine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading racks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posters</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hometown releases</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briefing materials</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameras</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special projects</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money the base pumps into the community</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base guides and yearbooks</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airman magazine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy letters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamphlets</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fact sheets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithograph series</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question-and-answer sessions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>about the Air Force</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily news digests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio and television stations</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Force Association</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE V continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tool</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fort Worth Air Power</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marquee at front gate</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*I = one of three most important internal information tools
C = one of three most important community relations tools
P = one of three most important public information tools

**A = Odom    B = Callaway    C = Jones    D = Cunningham
E = Acuña

maintained by month of publication of the articles and occupies a single filing cabinet drawer.\(^{15}\)

The Carswell Public Affairs Office's version of a futures book is the base newspaper editor's desk calendar, where he notes items of interest as they are brought to his attention.\(^{16}\)

Public affairs tools perceived as either "most important" or "other tools" by two of the Carswell public affairs personnel were commander's support, information program for wives, information staff, cooperation from wing personnel,

\(^{15}\)Personal observation by author while studying the Carswell Air Force Base Public Affairs Office.

\(^{16}\)Jones.
grapevine, special projects, Airman magazine, and the Fort Worth Air Power Council.

Public affairs tools perceived as either "most important" or "other tools" by one of the Carswell public affairs personnel were bulletin boards, information center, press club, reading racks, lithograph series, question-and-answer sessions about the Air Force, daily news digests, Air Force Association, and marquee at front gate.

All of the tools indicated by one person, except the Air Force Association and the marquee at the front gate, were perceived by Acuña. This suggests that (a) the administrative specialist, removed from the intricacies of specific products, sees the public affairs office from a substantially different perspective than the rest of the people assigned, and (b) those tools indicated by only one person are not used on a regular basis. These suggestions are supported by the fact that Acuña indicated each of the tools perceived by two of the Carswell public affairs personnel. In fact, he indicated all of the tools on the list provided during the interview.

Since the Carswell public affairs personnel seemed task-oriented, with little perception of their publics, tools, or overall public affairs program, it might be expected that they would show the same tendency toward public affairs activities. Indeed, the expectation appears justified.
During the interview, each of the Carswell public affairs personnel was given a list of possible public affairs activities, and he was asked to indicate which ones the Carswell Air Force Base Public Affairs Office performs.

The list was derived from activities specified in Air Force Manual 190-9 (since superseded by Air Force Regulation 190-1) and from public relations textbooks. Most of the activities on the list were required by Air Force regulation and should exist in some form at every Air Force public affairs office.

Since all, or almost all, of the listed activities were presumably used by the Carswell Air Force Base Public Affairs Office, insight into personnel awareness of the office's functions can be gained by looking at which of these activities were perceived by the people assigned to the office.

The activities perceived by all five of the Carswell public affairs personnel were base newspapers, base tours, open houses, speeches, posters, hometown releases, and base guides and yearbooks.

The activities perceived by four of the Carswell public affairs personnel were mass media liaison, commander's call, base-community council, and briefings.

The activities perceived by three of the Carswell public affairs personnel were personal letters from commanders to parents of airmen and young officers, special projects, pamphlets, and fact sheets.
### TABLE VI

**PUBLIC AFFAIRS ACTIVITIES AS PERCEIVED BY CARSWELL PUBLIC AFFAIRS PERSONNEL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base newspaper</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass media liaison</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commander's call</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base-community council</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base tours</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open houses</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speeches</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs to orient newly</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arrived personnel and their families</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information program for wives</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal letters from</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commanders to parents of airmen and young officers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulletin boards</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information center</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briefings</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading racks</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posters</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hometown releases</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special projects</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base guides and yearbooks</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy letters</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE VI continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pamphlets</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fact Sheets</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily news digests</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marquee at front gate</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A = Odom   B = Callaway   C = Jones   D = Cunningham   E = Acuña

The activities perceived by two of the Carswell public affairs personnel were information center, policy letters, and other not listed.

The activities perceived by one of the Carswell public affairs personnel were programs to orient newly arrived personnel and their families, information program for wives, bulletin boards, and the marquee at the front gate.

The activities perceived by none of the Carswell public affairs personnel were reading racks and daily news digests.

Most of the differences in perceived activities were due to differences in defining an activity, rather than any actual difference in knowledge or understanding of the office's functions. These differences in interpretation do
suggest, however, that the Carswell public affairs personnel do not talk to each other about the office's activities.

For example, Callaway did not indicate commander's call as one of the office's activities because the public affairs office does not conduct commander's call for the various units on base. The other four people indicated commander's call as one of the office's activities because the public affairs office provides information and assistance in the preparation of commander's call.

The same perception was the reason Cunningham indicated programs to orient newly arrived personnel and their families. He knew that the program was not conducted by the public affairs office, but he regarded it as one of the office's activities because of the information and assistance provided to the organization actually conducting the orientation program.

At this point an interesting comparison can be made between Tables V and VI. The list of tools and the list of activities, though not identical, are very similar, indicating the possibility of a nonpublic affairs activity serving as a public affairs tool.

The public affairs office can use commander's call as a tool for disseminating information without taking responsibility for planning or conducting the program. The public affairs office may send information for commander's call to the squadron commander, who may include the information in
the program. However, a public affairs activity, such as an information program for wives, would almost have to be considered a public affairs tool.

Yet, when Tables V and VI are compared, such inconsistency occurs with base-community council, information programs for wives, bulletin boards, information center, posters, hometown releases, special projects, and fact sheets. Each of these items was indicated by at least one person as a public affairs activity without that same person also indicating the item as a public affairs tool.

This inconsistency does not invalidate the responses, but it does reinforce the earlier suggestion that the Carswell public affairs personnel are task-oriented and do not have a grasp of an overall public affairs program.

Carswell Public Affairs Personnel
Public Relations Awareness

At the beginning of the interview, each person was asked to define the terms "public relations," "internal or employee public," "employee relations," "employee communications," and "public affairs."

This question had two purposes: to obtain an understanding of what these terms meant to the particular individuals as a basis for interpreting answers to subsequent questions using the terms, and to obtain an indication of the understanding by Carswell public affairs personnel of
general public relations and military public relations concepts.

If a particular individual defined "employee relations" and "employee communication" essentially the same way, questions directed at differences between the two terms would probably not be understood by that person. Or, if a particular individual gave a term a definition different from conventional understanding of that term (as found in public relations textbooks and readings), answers to questions involving that term could be translated and compared with answers from other individuals.

Despite a lack of sophisticated responses by the Carswell public affairs personnel, they seemed to have a fair grasp of the terms and their distinctions. Responses often were inappropriate, but further questions indicated an understanding of the concepts, despite an inability to articulate them.

Callaway, Cunningham, and Acuña defined "employee public" as "working with the people on base," or some variation thereof. Further questioning along the lines "In public relations people talk about different groups of people as publics. Do you see this office dealing with specific groups of people? How would you define the internal or employee group?" indicated a clear perception of an "employee public." Answers were changed to "the people on base" or similar responses.
The other questions designed to gain insight into the degree of awareness of the Carswell public affairs personnel of the activities of the office outside their immediate work assignments, and their understanding of general public relations and military public relations concepts, have been discussed under "publics," "internal publics," "tools," and "activities."

The questions designed to gain insight into the understanding by the Carswell public affairs personnel of the public relations problems of the Air Force and of Carswell Air Force Base were essentially the same ones used to identify public relations problems of the Air Force and of Carswell Air Force Base.

Public Relations Problems of the Air Force

Combat duty, rigid lines of authority, and the lack of the right to quit are just three of the differences between military and civilian employment. To determine whether Carswell public affairs personnel recognized differences between the military and civilian communities, several questions were posed. These same questions were designed to identify those differences that might affect public relations problems, in particular, internal public relations problems.

The first question Carswell public affairs personnel were asked concerning Air Force public relations problems was, "What do you consider to be some special employee relations problems of the military?"
The answers varied and were not confined to problems unique to the military. The people interviewed all seemed to interpret the question as, "What are the most pressing employee relations problems of the military?"

Some form of communication problem was specifically mentioned three times and suggested once. The responses were as follows:

--Outmoded communication methods in talking to younger airmen, i.e., using newspapers and not television, even though younger airmen have been conditioned to get their news from television and television has better credibility with them;

--Lack of right to quit; job dissatisfaction;

--Lack of communication, especially with younger members; higher ranking people seem to forget about the little guy as long as he does his job;

--Breakdown in person-to-person communication between workers and supervisors;

--"Brown shoe mentality," i.e., wanting lower ranking people to obey without question;

--Regulated appearance (uniforms, short hair);

--Pay, advancement, i.e., not enough people in right places understand the problem;

--Child care; and

--Young people not taking discipline.
The second question Carswell public affairs personnel were asked concerning Air Force public relations problems was "What special internal communications needs do you think the Air Force has that are different from the needs of civilian industry?"

Odom and Callaway said the Air Force has no special internal communications needs different from those of civilian industry. Jones and Acuña said they did not know what the Air Force's special internal communications needs were. Cunningham said the military person has a greater need to know why he is doing what he is doing. He said,

"The guy on the flightline often times loses track of the rest of the base. If he lives in the barracks, his life on the base consists of the barracks, the chow hall, and the flightline where he does his work. He's not interested and doesn't know the equal importance that CBPO [base personnel] has, that accounting and finance has, that public affairs has. If they were better informed as to the whole picture, you'd have better motivation."

The effort to identify the public relations problems of the Air Force led to a series of questions based on "Fifty Barriers to Effective Communication in the Organization," presented by Charles Ditterline in 1971.18

---

17 Cunningham.

Each of the Carswell public affairs personnel was given a copy of the list of the fifty barriers and asked the following questions:

"Here is a list of 50 obstacles to communication. Which ones do you think are built into the military system?"

"How serious do you think those built-in obstacles are? Use a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being not particularly detrimental and 5 being very detrimental. Feel free to elaborate."

"Do you think those built-in obstacles can be surmounted and still leave the military a military?"

"How do you think those obstacles can be surmounted?"

"Which of the 50 obstacles on this list do you think exist at Carswell?"

"How serious do you think those obstacles are? Use a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being not particularly detrimental and 5 being very detrimental. Feel free to elaborate."

Among the Carswell public affairs personnel was little consensus on either which barriers are built into the military or the severity of those perceived to be built in.

Even though the Carswell public affairs personnel were not in complete agreement as to which barriers were built into the military, four of the barriers were indicated by all five of the Carswell public affairs personnel, and ten barriers were indicated by four of the Carswell public affairs personnel.

Odom, Callaway, Jones, and Cunningham indicated resistance to change, lack of personal contact with upper management, complicated or vague language, insufficient use of available media, and set attitudes.
Odom, Jones, Cunningham, and Acuña indicated failure to make intended message clear.

Callaway, Jones, Cunningham, and Acuña indicated company politics, prejudice, and asking employee sacrifices for the sake of production.

Odom, Callaway, Jones, and Acuña indicated too much information communicated at one time.

Seventeen barriers were indicated by three of the Carswell public affairs personnel as being built into the military; nine barriers were indicated by two of the Carswell public affairs personnel; eight barriers were indicated by one of the Carswell public affairs personnel; two barriers were indicated by none of the Carswell public affairs personnel.

The barriers to communication indicated by all five of the Carswell public affairs personnel as being built into the military were authoritarian attitude of management; too many corporate levels, resulting in distortion or loss of information; a status system due to supposed differences in rank; and inadequate compensation.

Odom and Acuña seemed to share a perspective on the severity of each of these four barriers, and Callaway, Jones, and Cunningham seemed to share a different perspective.

The first of these four barriers to communication, "authoritarian attitude of management," was seen as not particularly detrimental by Odom and Acuña and as moderately
TABLE VII
BUILT-IN COMMUNICATIONS BARRIERS AS PERCEIVED BY CARSWELL PUBLIC AFFAIRS PERSONNEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barrier</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E***</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Lack of communication policy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-/5</td>
<td>2/2**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Authoritarian attitude of management</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>3/5</td>
<td>1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Failure of management to keep promises</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Resistance to change</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Lack of personal contact with upper management</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>2/4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Too many corporate levels, resulting in distortion or loss of information</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>3/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Failure to make intended message clear</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>2/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Failure to listen</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Company politics</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>2/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Favoritism</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>1/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Complicated or vague language</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Lack of job security</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Fear of consequences</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>3/5</td>
<td>1/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Lack of empathy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>2/4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Overloading supervisors</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Lack of follow-up</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Jealousy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3/3*</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>1/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrier</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Prejudice</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>1/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Insufficient training in communication</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Poorly defined responsibility and authority</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Inopportune timing</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. The hostile grapevine</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5/5+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Too much information communicated at one time</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Overconfidence in knowing what others are thinking</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Size of business</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Complexity of business</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Physical distance</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Apathy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>2/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Heterogenity of audience</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Timidity</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Lack of sufficient equipment or facilities</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>-/4</td>
<td>3/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Wrong use of media</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>2/4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Insufficient use of available media</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Failure to use a new approach</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Temperature and environmental climate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TABLE VII continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barrier</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36. Set attitudes</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Underestimating employee intelligence</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Overestimating amount of available information</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. A status system due to supposed differences in rank</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>3/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Semantics</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Defensiveness</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Failure to determine the attitudes of the audience</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Decentralization</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Not being open for suggestions</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3/5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Stifling creativity</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2/4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Lack of incentive to work</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>3/5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Inadequate compensation</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>5/5+</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>3/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Asking employee sacrifices for the sake of production</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>2/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Lack of promotional opportunity</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5/4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Incompetence in management</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = officers only (number 17)
**Numbers on left of diagonal represent severity of barrier in the Air Force; numbers on right of diagonal represent severity of barrier at Carswell Air Force Base.**

***A = Odom  B = Callaway  C = Jones  D = Cunningham  E = Acuña

The barriers to communication indicated by four of the Carswell public affairs personnel as being built into the military were resistance to change, lack of personal contact with upper management, failure to make intended message clear, company politics, complicated or vague language, prejudice, too much information communicated at one time, insufficient use of available media, set attitudes, and asking employee sacrifices for the sake of production.

No pattern of severity rating was readily apparent, other than that certain individuals tended to consistently rate the barriers in the same direction. Jones seemed to rate most barriers as very detrimental, whereas Acuña seemed to rate most barriers as not very detrimental. This pattern seemed to represent personal satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the Air Force more than anything else.
The barriers to communication indicated by three of the Carswell public affairs personnel as being built into the military were failure management to keep promises, failure to listen, favoritism, fear of consequences, jealousy, size of business, complexity of business, apathy, lack of equipment or facilities, wrong use of media, failure to use a new approach, semantics, failure to determine the attitudes of the audience, not being open for suggestions, stifling creativity, lack of incentive to work, and incompetence in management. The pattern of severity rating seemed to follow personal satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the Air Force rather than anything else.

The barriers to communication indicated by two of the Carswell public affairs personnel as being built into the military were lack of empathy, overloading supervisors, lack of follow-up, insufficient training in communication, the hostile grapevine, overconfidence in knowing what others are thinking, underestimating employee intelligence, defensiveness, and lack of promotional opportunity.

The barriers to communication indicated by one of the Carswell public affairs personnel as being built into the military were lack of communication policy, lack of job security, poorly defined responsibility and authority, inopportune timing, physical distance, heterogeneity of audience, timidity, and overestimating amount of available information.
An interesting severity pattern emerged among the barriers to communication indicated by one of the Carswell public affairs personnel. Each of these barriers, except one, was indicated by either Callaway or Acuña and was rated as moderately detrimental to not very detrimental. The one exception, "heterogeneity of audience," was indicated by Odom and was rated as fairly detrimental.

Two barriers to communication were not indicated by any of the Carswell public affairs personnel: temperature and environmental climate and decentralization.

One further question was used to try to identify the internal communications problems of the Air Force. Each of the Carswell public affairs personnel was given a copy of a list of possible problems and asked, "What is the biggest problem in Carswell's public affairs program? Please put a '1' before the biggest problem, a '2' before the next biggest problem, etc., on the following list. If an item is not a problem, leave it blank."

Answers varied, but some aspect of manning was indicated as the biggest problem in Carswell's public affairs program by Odom, Callaway, Jones, and Cunningham. Acuña indicated two other problems ahead of manning.

All five of the Carswell public affairs personnel indicated "manning not up to authorized strength" as a problem in Carswell's public affairs program.
## TABLE VIII

### PUBLIC AFFAIRS PROBLEMS AS PERCEIVED BY CARSWELL PUBLIC AFFAIRS PERSONNEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E***</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of cooperation from commander</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of fully qualified personnel</td>
<td>1A*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manning:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>authorized strength inadequate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2A*</td>
<td>1A*</td>
<td>1A*</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not up to authorized strength</td>
<td>1A*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1A*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of, or poor guidance from higher headquarters</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems with publisher of base newspaper</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of time</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Force performance criteria</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too many &quot;crash&quot; programs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of understanding of Public Affairs Office by commander</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of understanding of Public Affairs Office by base personnel</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional duties</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank-pulling</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support from other agencies on base</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE VIII continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of understanding of Public Affairs Office by higher headquarters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excessive paperwork</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public apathy and opposition to military</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of overall, cohesive program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reluctance to change in Air Force</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hometown releases</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base newspaper</td>
<td></td>
<td>2A**</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other(s) not listed (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC's performance criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with local retiree community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1A*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*1A = tied for first with another problem
**2A = tied for second with another problem

***A = Odom  B = Callaway  C = Jones  D = Cunningham  E = Acuña

Problems indicated by four of the Carswell public affairs personnel were authorized manning strength inadequate,
lack of time, and lack of support from other agencies on base.

Problems indicated by three of the Carswell public affairs personnel were lack of fully qualified personnel, too many "crash" programs, lack of understanding of Public Affairs Office by base personnel, additional duties, and base newspaper.

Problems indicated by two of the Carswell public affairs personnel were lack of, or poor guidance from higher headquarters; excessive paperwork; lack of equipment; public apathy and opposition to military; lack of overall, cohesive program; reluctance to change in the Air Force; and dealing with local retiree community.

Problems indicated by one of the Carswell public affairs personnel were lack of cooperation from the commander, problems with publisher of base newspaper, Air Force performance criteria, lack of understanding of Public Affairs Office by commander, rank-pulling, lack of understanding of Public Affairs Office by higher headquarters, hometown releases, and SAC's performance criteria.

By pulling together the answers to all the items designed to identify public relations problems of the Air Force, the following list is proposed. The criterion for each item is the indication or mention by at least four of the five Carswell public affairs personnel.
Public Relations Problems of the Air Force (A)

1. Communication problems (outmoded methods, lack of, breakdown of, lack of understanding)

2. Authoritarian attitude of management

3. Too many corporate levels, resulting in distortion or loss of information

4. A status system due to supposed differences in rank.

5. Inadequate compensation

6. Resistance to change

7. Lack of personal contact with upper management

8. Failure to make intended message clear

9. Company politics

10. Complicated or vague language

11. Prejudice

12. Too much information communicated at one time

13. Insufficient use of available media

14. Set attitudes

15. Asking employee sacrifice for the sake of production

16. Manning not up to authorized strength

17. Authorized Manning strength inadequate

18. Lack of time

19. Lack of support from other agencies on base

This list is not in any sort of rank order, rather it evolved from the sequence of questions used to identify public relations problems in the military, particularly in the Air Force. Some of the items can be combined and modified to form a shorter list, which follows.
Public Relations Problems of the Air Force (B)

1. Communications problems (outmoded methods, lack of, breakdown of, lack of understanding, failure to make message clear, complicated or vague language, too much information communicated at one time)

2. Authoritarian attitude of management

3. Too many corporate levels, resulting in distortion or loss of information

4. A status system due to supposed differences in rank

5. Inadequate compensation

6. Resistance to change and fixed attitudes

7. Lack of personal contact with upper management

8. Company politics

9. Prejudice

10. Insufficient use of available media

11. Asking employee sacrifice for the sake of production

12. Inadequate manning (authorized strength inadequate, not up to authorized strength)

13. Lack of time

14. Lack of support from other agencies on base

This is not to say these problems are unique to the Air Force. Some, according to the people interviewed, are part of human nature. But this list of problems seems to warrant attention because the items on the list are seen by the Carswell public affairs personnel as either most pressing or built into the military.

If the Carswell Air Force Base Public Affairs Office is typical of Air Force public affairs offices, it would be reasonable to assume that the same items would be indicated
as public affairs problems by personnel in other Air Force public affairs offices. Logically, these items need special attention or effort from public affairs personnel.

Carswell public affairs personnel responded to the question about surmounting communications barriers built into the military with the following answers:

Education, awareness, empathy;¹⁹

Cannot be surmounted and still leave the military a military;²⁰
Clearer statements, less wishy-washy attitudes throughout the military; get rid of the deadwood, get some new thinkers; implement the program currently on paper; more discipline;²¹

Better training; better selection of the people you put in management; re-evaluate the promotion system; education [on listening]; management education;²²
Can be surmounted, but don't know how;²³

Most of these responses tended to be rather vague and not particularly useful. However, they do indicate a belief that solutions are possible, and that belief may be the deciding factor determining success or failure of efforts to address the public relations problems of the Air Force.

¹⁹Odom.
²⁰Callaway.
²¹Jones.
²²Cunningham.
²³Acuña.
CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary

This study analyzed the employee public relations and internal communications efforts of the military through a case study of the Carswell Air Force Base Public Affairs Office.

The Air Force has several levels of public affairs authority and activity, and base-level public affairs is only a part of the picture. However, the base is a good place, perhaps the best place, to begin when examining public affairs, especially internal public affairs, in the military.

This study sought information concerning internal public relations in the military. The information was derived from Air Force regulations and publications and from interviews with the Carswell public affairs personnel.

The prime goal of the Air Force internal information program is "to keep personnel fully informed so that the end result is high morale, higher productivity, and retention."\(^1\)

This could also be considered the prime goal of the Carswell Air Force Base internal information [public affairs] program.

\(^1\)Air Force Regulation 190-1 2-1, February 16, 1982.
The objectives of the Air Force internal information program are listed in Air Force Regulation 190-1.\(^2\)

Responses from the Carswell public affairs personnel, regarding the short-range and long-range goals and objectives of the Carswell Air Force Base Public Affairs Office, were five news releases per month; five speeches about the command, about the Air Force, in the community per month; six base tours per month; one squadron open house per year, per squadron;\(^3\) "to be able to have the office function without me;" "to eliminate the discontent of the civilian populace [about] the noise from Carswell;"\(^4\) "to maintain a good relationship with the civilian public, as well as to inform the people in the military what's going on in the Air Force;"\(^5\) education and training of both internal and external populace of the base;\(^6\) "to have total cooperation throughout the base, total understanding within the community outside the base;"\(^7\)

[short-range] serve in an advisory capacity to the wing commander and other military people on base,

\(^2\)Ibid., 2-2a-k.
\(^3\)Odom.
\(^4\)Ibid.
\(^5\)Interview with Staff Sergeant Robert E. Callaway, June 4, 1980.
\(^6\)Interview with Staff Sergeant Charles D. Jones, May 23, 1980.
\(^7\)Ibid.
and seeing that their dealings with the public or political figures are done so that no discredit or nothing bad happens to make the Air Force look bad, as well as to try to keep the members assigned to the base educated and informed as to what's going on in the world around them, military-wise

[long-range] to work constantly at building as good a relationship as possible with the people downtown; and, "I don't really know if we have any long-range goals. Usually our short-range goals are like putting out the paper every week, putting out our monthly reports, general stuff like that."\(^9\)

These responses tended to be task-oriented and indicated a lack of understanding or awareness by the Carswell public affairs personnel of goals and objectives of the Carswell Air Force Base Public Affairs Office. That is, responses of the Carswell public affairs personnel indicated a lack of goals and objectives, and hence a lack of direction beyond day-to-day tasks.

The Carswell Air Force Base Public Affairs Office followed the Air Force public affairs organizational pattern of three functional areas: community relations, public information, and internal information. The three areas are not always neatly separated, as when a particular activity, such as a base open house, reaches the local residents, the

---

\(^8\) Interview with Sergeant Gary E. Cunningham, June 6, 1980.

\(^9\) Interview with Sergeant Luis Acuña, May 23, 1980.
people outside the immediate area (through media attention), and the base population.

The internal publics of Carswell Air Force Base, as perceived by at least four of the five Carswell public affairs personnel, were telephone operators, receptionists and guards, correspondents, supervisors and foremen, and managers and executives.

Responses from the Carswell public affairs personnel indicated a certain degree of confusion concerning publics, and this confusion may have distorted answers and, thus, the validity of the answer to this question of who are the internal publics of Carswell Air Force Base.

The internal information activities indicated by at least four of the five Carswell public affairs personnel were base newspaper, commander's call, hometown releases, and base guides and yearbooks. There were other activities, such as posters and bulletin boards, that might normally be considered forms of internal communication, but they were not considered to be such by four or more of the Carswell public affairs personnel.

Only one of the five Carswell public affairs personnel perceived the Air Force as having any internal communications needs different from the needs of civilian industry. He said the military person has a greater need to know why he's doing what he's doing and how it fits into the bigger picture.
A list of the special problems of the Air Force was derived from answers to other questions, particularly one asking the Carswell public affairs personnel which of a list of fifty barriers to communication were built into the military. If communication barriers are built into the military, the reasoning goes, then those barriers become special problems because they cannot be eliminated but must be dealt with on a continuing basis.

Other items added to the list came from answers to a question on which problems from a proposed list were the biggest problems of the Carswell public affairs program.

Those problems considered special to the Air Force, and perhaps to any branch of the military, were

1. Communication problems (outmoded methods, lack of, breakdown of, lack of understanding, failure to make message clear, complicated or vague language, too much information communicated at one time);

2. Authoritarian attitude of management;

3. Too many corporate levels, resulting in distortion or loss of information;

4. A status system due to supposed differences in rank;

5. Inadequate compensation;

6. Resistance to change and fixed attitudes;

7. Lack of personal contact with upper management;

8. Company politics;

9. Prejudice;

10. Insufficient use of available media;

11. Asking employee sacrifice for the sake of production;
12. Inadequate manning (authorized strength inadequate, not up to authorized strength);

13. Lack of time;

14. Lack of support from other agencies on base.

This is not to say these problems are unique to the Air Force. Some, according to the people interviewed, are part of human nature. But this list of problems seems to warrant attention because the items on the list are seen by the Carswell public affairs personnel as either most pressing or built into the military.

Conclusions

The typical member of the Carswell Air Force Base Public Affairs Office is a noncommissioned officer, thirty-one years old, born in the South, married, with fourteen years education, eleven years in the Air Force, two years at Carswell, six years in public affairs work in the Air Force, little study or civilian experience in public affairs work, and intending to remain in public affairs work in the Air Force.

The Carswell public affairs personnel showed some understanding of basic public relations terms but were not able to articulate that understanding without help. They did not seem to have a clear grasp of public relations concepts beyond the definitions offered.

The Carswell public relations personnel seemed to be task-oriented, with little clear concept of goals or objectives except in vague terms or in terms of day-to-day tasks.
The day-to-day tasks appeared to have become goals in themselves, rather than means toward goals. This lack of clear goals and objectives seemed to leave the Carswell public affairs personnel without direction and in a primarily responsive posture. That is, they are forced to respond to situations rather than to anticipate and plan for them.

This lack of understanding of stated goals was reflected in responses concerning the publics of Carswell Air Force Base. The respondents did not seem to understand that they ought to gear their efforts to particular groups of people, although they did seem to understand that there were different groups.

The task-orientation and lack of perception by the Carswell public affairs personnel of their publics reflect a tendency that is reflected further in their perceptions of public affairs activities. At Carswell, there appears to be a tendency to do whatever works. With that strategy and little or no formal training in public relations, Carswell public affairs personnel seem to muddle through, never knowing there might be a better way to do things.

Indeed, perceptions of tools and activities produced inconsistencies that made this overall lack of understanding of concepts and goals rather vivid. The fact that individuals could perceive certain activities of the office and not see those activities as tools graphically highlights this lack
of clear understanding of either public relations concepts or an overall public affairs program.

Any special public relations problems of the military, in particular internal communications problems, are overshadowed by the lack of training and lack of understanding of public relations concepts by the Carswell public affairs personnel. In other words, it does no good to say one leaking pipe is worse than any other leaking pipe if the people responsible for the repair do not know what tools are available to them or do not know how to use properly the tools they do have.

Responses by Carswell public affairs personnel to questions concerning built-in barriers to communication in the military provided two conclusions about the Carswell Public Affairs Office. Especially telling were those barriers perceived by everyone in the Carswell Public Affairs Office except the director of public affairs. This strongly suggests that the Carswell public affairs personnel do not talk to each other in terms of where the office is going and what is happening along the way. In particular, the director is not talking to his staff about what needs to be done, how it should be done, or what the problems of the office are. If the Carswell public affairs personnel are not communicating with each other, they can hardly expect to communicate with people outside their office.
Differences in perception of the severity of those barriers seen as built into the military seemed to relate more directly to individual satisfaction and dissatisfaction with the Air Force than to anything else. The individual who seemed most satisfied with the Air Force was the administrative specialist—the individual least involved with public affairs. The individual who seemed most dissatisfied with the Air Force was the editor of the base newspaper—the individual perhaps most involved with public affairs, at least with the most visible product of public affairs.

Although the problems identified in this study are not necessarily unique to the Air Force, they are worth noting. If the Carswell Public Affairs Office is typical of Air Force public affairs offices, it would be reasonable to assume that the same items would be indicated as public affairs problems by personnel in other Air Force public affairs offices. Logically, these items need special attention or effort from public affairs personnel.

Responses to questions on how to surmount those barriers to communication built into the military were rather vague and not particularly useful. However, they did indicate a belief that solutions are possible, and that belief may be the deciding factor determining success or failure of efforts to address the public relations problems of the Air Force.
Perhaps the biggest problem for military public affairs offices lies with the ambiguity with which Congress views such activity in government-controlled bodies.

As public relations professionals, military public affairs personnel can be expected to see their function in traditional public relations terms, that is, telling the "company story," generating good will, providing information about the "company" to news media, and so forth. Congress, on the other hand, seems to see the public affairs function as providing information as it is requested. Any active reaching out with information seems to be viewed by Congress (and many American citizens) with suspicion and to be labeled as propaganda in the sense of telling lies or trying to win undeserved favors. This suspicion is vividly reflected in the avoidance of the term "public relations" to the point of silliness at times.

With the two conflicting self-images, it is not at all surprising to find public affairs personnel without a clear understanding of their goals.

This confusion can be expected to carry over into management principles. Clearly, if a public affairs office is merely supplying information as requested, it does not need as many people or the same equipment as it would need to reach out actively with information or to try to generate good will in the community.
This writer's experience in military public affairs supports the assumption that the Carswell Public Affairs Office is typical of Air Force public affairs offices. Personnel are intelligent and well-motivated, but they are, in general, undertrained. The reasoning seems to be that they do not need public relations training to respond to requests for information. They are trained to do their specific tasks and little more because that is all that is needed. This sort of thinking is, of course, backward and tends to perpetuate the image of unskilled public relations by the military.

Still, there are those in military public relations who see the larger picture and do manage to have effective programs, even while saddled with the congressional ambiguity about what to call government-controlled information functions. Unfortunately, Carswell Air Force Base does not appear to have such a person in public affairs management.

However, the job seems to get done, perhaps not as effectively or as efficiently as possible or desired, but it does seem to get done adequately for the most part.

This brings into question the need for making sharp distinctions between publics or tools or activities or quality of public relations training. It is interesting to sort and label concepts, but in real-life situations it appears that the need for such delineations is not as strong as classroom lectures would suggest, at least not in all situations. Perhaps the distinctions are more academic than actual.
That is not to say there is no need for formal public relations training. Indeed, there are times when the public relations professional wants to target a specific audience, but if he (or she) knows to whom he is talking, does his staff need to know? How much benefit is gained when the staff understands the concepts as opposed to when they merely perform the tasks assigned to them? It would seem that there is some benefit, but not much, to be gained.

The Carswell Public Affairs Office provides a good example of this. The public affairs personnel have little or no formal training in public relations, yet they are intelligent and well-motivated. Each has an understanding of his particular task and what it can accomplish, learned from experience, and can readily understand public relations concepts when they are explained. That is, they see the concepts as translated in reality. They have little notion of an overall goal, but that understanding ought to be the responsibility of the director. The director's function ought to be to see the larger goals and to guide the individual tasks toward the accomplishment of those goals.

The fact that the Carswell public affairs director seems not to perform that function is a management weakness and not necessarily a flaw in the system of military public affairs. Given that the director is providing inadequate guidance, increasing authorized manning or filling empty positions (the main problems indicated by the Carswell public affairs
personnel) can hardly be expected to change the effectiveness of the office. More people, under the same management, would probably lead to more tasks being done but little or no increase in overall public affairs effectiveness.

This leads to the larger conclusion that formal public relations training is important for those in public affairs management but perhaps overemphasized for those in nonmanagement positions.

Until Congress allows military public affairs personnel to function as public relations professionals, it seems likely that public relations principles and concepts can apply only partially to the military situation, and perhaps military public relations ought to be viewed as a separate area of study in formal public relations training.

Recommendations for Further Study

This study answered the questions it set out to answer and shed some light on the relationship between civilian public relations and military public affairs, particularly in the effects congressional mandate has on military public affairs.

The ambiguity of purpose and apparent resulting lack of commitment to formal public relations training tends to produce an unskilled but well-motivated staff. But the problem of untrained personnel may be one shared by civilian industry. In that case, the same over-shadowing of problems by the lack of knowledge of public relations concepts by personnel may
be true, and perhaps the same sort of study ought to be done on an organization large enough and complex enough to provide a parallel to the Carswell situation.

Other studies recommended include a replication of this study at another Air Force installation, one of different size and relationship to the community, e.g., in a rural area or a much larger or smaller installation. Any studies replicating this study could be greatly simplified by reducing the number of interview questions and by having respondents write out in advance certain portions, such as the questions involving lists. The interviewer's presence did not seem necessary with those questions.
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Article 134. General article

Though not specifically mentioned in this chapter, all disorders and neglects to the prejudice of good order and discipline in the armed forces, all conduct of a nature to bring discredit upon the armed forces, and crimes and offenses not capital, of which persons subject to this chapter may be guilty, shall be taken cognizance of by a general, special or summary court-martial, according to the nature and degree of the offense, and shall be punished at the discretion of that court.

(Title 10 United States Code, 934)

The cases heard by the United States Supreme Court upholding the general article were Parker versus Levy, 417 U.S. 733 (1974) and Secretary of the Navy versus Avrech, 418 U.S. 676 (1974).

"Captain Levy spent more than two years in a federal prison for refusing to train Green Beret troops during the Vietnam war."¹

"Marine Private Avrech was court-martialed for attempting to publish a statement against the war in Vietnam while stationed there."²

²Ibid.
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Questionnaire

1. Name
2. Rank
3. Date of birth
4. Place of birth
5. Marital status:
   - Never been married
   - Married
   - Divorced or widowed
6. Number of children
7. Please indicate the highest level of education you have completed, the month and year completed, and the school where completed.
   - High school
   - Some college
   - Some graduate work
   - Master's degree or above
8. How many hours of college-level journalism courses have you completed?
   - Hours
   - When completed
   - Where completed
9. What military journalism studies have you completed?
   Studies
   When completed
   Where completed

10. Which organizations do you belong to?
    On base
    Off base

11. How many years of military service do you have?

12. How many years have you served in the Air Force?

13. If you have served in a branch of the military other than the Air Force, please indicate which branch and how long you served.
    Branch
    Years served

14. Are (or were) any of your relatives career military members?
    Relationship
    Rank
    Branch
    Dates

15. How long have you been at Carswell?

16. Of your time at Carswell, how much has been in the Public Affairs Office?

17. What is your job title?

18. Please briefly describe your duties.

19. How many years total have you been in the military public affairs field?
20. If you have worked in a military career field other than public affairs, please indicate which one and how long you worked in that field.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career field</th>
<th>Years in field</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

21. How did you enter the public affairs career field? That is, did you request it?

22. Would you like to remain in the public affairs field for the remainder of your time in the Air Force?

23. If not, what field do you prefer? Please include your reasons.

24. When you separate or retire, what job do you want?

25. What year are you planning to separate or retire?

26. Do you have any civilian experience in journalism or public relations?

   | What type? | How long? |

27. What personal awards have you received for information work? Please include civilian and military awards.

28. Are (or were) other members of your family in journalism or public relations?

   | Relationship | Career | Time in career |
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Interview Questions

1. Please define the following terms:
   - Public relations
   - Internal or employee public
   - Employee relations
   - Employee communications
   - Public affairs

2. Do you think that Carswell is typical of military installations in the functioning of its Public Affairs Office? Please explain.

3. What do you consider to be some special employee relations problems of the military?

4. What special internal communications needs do you think the Air Force has that are different from the needs of civilian industry?

5. Do you think there is a difference between the military's peace time and war time internal communications needs? Please explain.

6. What do you see as the functions of the Air Force internal public affairs program? (For example, keep the troops happy, socialize troops into the military, etc.)

7. Do you think the Air Force internal public affairs program has any effect on discipline problems or retention? Please explain.

8. How much cooperation is there between the Public Affairs Office and other agencies involved in internal public affairs?

9. What are those other agencies and what do they do?

10. What are the goals and objectives, both short-range and long-range, of Carswell's Public Affairs Office?
11. The following are publics frequently dealt with by civilian industry. Check those publics, or essentially similar publics, with which Carswell's Public Affairs Office must deal. [LIST]

12. What are the sizes of these publics?

13. The following are internal publics frequently dealt with by civilian industry. Check those publics, or essentially similar publics, with which Carswell's Public Affairs Office must deal. [LIST]

14. What are the sizes of these publics?

15. Does Carswell's Public Affairs Office deal with any group on base as a separate public? (For example, civilian employees, security police, etc.)

16. What sort of feedback does Carswell's Public Affairs Office get from its publics? Please indicate the kind and relative amount of feedback.

17. Please describe the area served by Carswell's Public Affairs Office, including its size and nature.

18. Does the size or nature of the surrounding community affect the Public Affairs Office's ability to meet its overall goals? Please explain.

19. Does the size or nature of the surrounding community affect the Public Affairs Office's ability to meet the base's internal communications needs and goals? Please explain.

20. With what media does Carswell's Public Affairs Office deal on a regular basis? Please include number and names.

   Newspapers
   Radio stations
   TV stations
   Civilian company publications
   University publications
   Other (please specify)

21. How does the Air Force address itself to the effects of the "grapevine"?
Publics (Question 11)

The following are publics frequently dealt with by civilian industry. Check those publics, or essentially similar publics, with which Carswell's Public Affairs Office must deal.

Constituent (noncommercial organizations, such as the YMCA)
Employees
Owners
Customers
Community
Educators
Government:
  Federal
  State
  City
  Other (e.g., county, school district, regulatory agencies)
Suppliers
Dealers or distributors
Competitors
Groups promoting themselves
Groups set up to impact things in the public eye
Mass media
Other(s) not listed (please specify)
Internal Publics (Question 13)

The following are internal publics frequently dealt with by civilian industry. Check those publics, or essentially similar publics, with which Carswell's Public Affairs Office must deal.

Salespeople
Service people
Purchasing agents
Receptionists and guards
Telephone operators
Correspondents
Supervisors and foremen
Managers and executives
Other(s) not listed (please specify)
22. How does Carswell's Public Affairs Office address itself to the effects of the "grapevine"?

23. Do you see much difference in public affairs programs among the various commands? Please explain.

24. What other commands are represented on Carswell Air Force Base? (Other than SAC, that is.)

25. Do the tenant commands have their own Public Affairs Offices or the equivalent?

26. What is the budget of the Public Affairs Office at Carswell?

27. Please describe the public affairs table of organization.

28. Is internal communication up, as well as down, encouraged by the Air Force public affairs program?

29. How is this two-way information flow implemented?

30. Has internal public affairs changed since the end of the draft? Please explain.

31. Does the Air Force have any plans for adjusting its internal communications program in the event of reinstatement of the draft? Please explain.

32. What number of personnel, by rank, is the Public Affairs Office at Carswell authorized? Please include civilians.

33. What number of personnel, by rank, is assigned to the Public Affairs Office at Carswell? Please include civilians.

34. How are personnel selected for public affairs jobs in the Air Force?

35. What are the educational requirements for public affairs personnel? (Personnel Assignments Data)

36. Does the Air Force provide and/or encourage continued professional training through seminars, conferences, off-duty schooling, or other sources? Please consider civilian seminars, conferences, etc., in answering this question.
37. How much contact is there between Carswell's public affairs personnel and civilian public relations people? Please explain, including type of contact and relative frequency.

38. Do personnel in Carswell's Public Affairs Office make contributions to Air Force publications? Please explain.

39. Do personnel in Carswell's Public Affairs Office make contributions to civilian publications. Please explain.

40. From your experience and contact with other public affairs personnel, is the promotion potential of public affairs personnel any better or any worse than that of personnel in other career fields? Please explain.

41. Do you think this affects turnover of personnel or skill levels of personnel assigned to public affairs? Please explain.

42. Here is a list of 50 obstacles to communication. Which ones do you think are built into the military system? [LIST]

43. How serious do you think those built-in obstacles are? Use a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being not particularly detrimental and 5 being very detrimental. Feel free to elaborate.

44. Do you think those built-in obstacles can be surmounted and still leave the military a military?

45. How do you think those obstacles can be surmounted?

46. Which of the 50 obstacles on this list do you think exist at Carswell?

47. How serious do you think those obstacles are? Use a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being not particularly detrimental and 5 being very detrimental. Feel free to elaborate.

48. How do you think those obstacles can be surmounted?

49. In your opinion, which of the following areas of the public affairs program is the most important to the Air Force mission? Rank the areas by putting a "1" before the most important, a "2" before the next most important, and a "3" before the least important.
Fifty Barriers to Effective Communication in the Organization (Question 42)

1. Lack of communication policy.
2. Authoritarian attitude of management.
3. Failure of management to keep promises.
4. Resistance to change.
5. Lack of personal contact with upper management.
6. Too many corporate levels, resulting in distortion or loss of information.
7. Failure to make intended message clear.
8. Failure to listen.
10. Favoritism.
11. Complicated or vague language.
12. Lack of job security.
13. Fear of consequences.
15. Overloading supervisors.
16. Lack of follow-up.
17. Jealousy.
18. Prejudice.
19. Insufficient training in communication.
20. Poorly defined responsibility and authority.
21. Inopportune timing.
22. The hostile grapevine.
23. Too much information communicated at one time.
24. Overconfidence in knowing what others are thinking.
27. Physical distance.
28. Apathy.
29. Heterogeneity of audience.
30. Timidity.
31. Lack of sufficient equipment or facilities.
32. Wrong use of media.
33. Insufficient use of available media.
34. Failure to use a new approach.
35. Temperature and environmental climate.
36. Set attitudes.
37. Underestimating employee intelligence.
38. Overestimating amount of available information.
39. A status system due to supposed differences in rank.
40. Semantics.
41. Defensiveness.
42. Failure to determine the attitudes of the audience.
43. Decentralization.
44. Not being open for suggestions.
45. Stifling creativity.
46. Lack of incentive to work.
47. Inadequate compensation.
48. Asking employee sacrifices for the sake of production.
49. Lack of promotional opportunity.
50. Incompetence in management.
Community relations
Internal information
Public information

50. In your opinion, which area of those mentioned in question 49 causes the Carswell Public Affairs Office the most problems?

51. What specific tasks/responsibilities within the area ranked as presenting the most problems are the Carswell Public Affairs Office's biggest problems?

52. What is the biggest problem in Carswell's public affairs program? Please put a "1" before the biggest problem, a "2" before the next biggest problem, etc., on the following list. If an item is not a problem, leave it blank. [LIST]

53. In which of the following areas do you experience the most job satisfaction, in terms of reward received for effort expended? Rank the areas by putting a "1" before the most satisfying, a "2" before the next most satisfying, and a "3" before the least satisfying.

   Community relations
   Internal information
   Public information

54. For each of the three areas mentioned in question 53, what do you consider to be Carswell's three (3) most important information tools? Please indicate in order of importance and include your reasons. [LIST]

   Community relations
   a.
   b.
   c.

   Internal information
   a.
   b.
   c.
Problems (Question 52)

What is the biggest problem in Carswell's public affairs program? Please put a "1" before the biggest problem, a "2" before the next biggest problem, etc., on the following list. If an item is not a problem, leave it blank.

Lack of cooperation from commander
Lack of fully qualified personnel
Manning:
  Authorized strength inadequate
  Not up to authorized strength
Lack of, or poor guidance from higher headquarters
Problems with publisher of base newspaper
Lack of time
Air Force performance criteria
Too many "crash" programs
Lack of understanding of Public Affairs Office by commander
Lack of understanding of Public Affairs Office by base personnel
Additional duties
Rank pulling
Lack of support from other agencies on base
Lack of understanding of Public Affairs Office by higher headquarters
Excessive paperwork
Lack of equipment
Public apathy and opposition to military
Lack of overall, cohesive program
Reluctance to change in Air Force
Hometown releases

Base newspaper

Other(s) not listed (please specify)
Information Tools (Question 54)

Base newspaper
Mass media
Commander's call
Base-community council
Base tours
Open houses
Commander's support
Personal contacts with military and civilians
Speakers
Programs orienting newly arrived personnel and their families
Information programs for wives
Personal letters from commanders to parents of airmen and young officers
Bulletin boards
Information center
Information staff
Squadron information officers
Staff meetings
Press club
Cooperation from wing personnel
Briefings
Grapevine
Telephone
Reading racks
Posters
Hometown releases
Briefing materials
Cameras
Special projects
Money the base pumps into the community
Base guides and yearbooks
Airman magazine
Policy letters
Pamphlets
Fact sheets
Air Force biography
Lithograph series
Question-and-answer sessions about the Air Force
Daily news digests
Radio and television stations
Other(s) not listed (please specify)
Public information

a.

b.

c.

55. What other tools does the Carswell Public Affairs Office use on a regular basis? Please indicate the approximate frequency of use.

56. What public affairs activities does the Carswell Public Affairs Office perform? [LIST]

57. How many people are reached with each activity? (For example, press run on the base newspaper, attendance at commander's call, etc.)

58. Of these, which do you consider to be internal public affairs activities?

59. Approximately how much time is spent each day on internal communications?

60. Does the Carswell Public Affairs Office keep a futures book? Please indicate what sort of items are included.

61. Does the Carswell Public Affairs Office keep a clippings file? Please indicate how the file is organized, that is, what categories are used.

62. Does the Carswell Public Affairs Office subscribe to any newspapers or periodicals? Please indicate which ones and when the subscription was started.

63. Do the personnel in the Carswell Public Affairs Office have regular staff meetings?

64. Please describe a typical meeting. Include frequency, usual length, topics covered, and meeting format.

65. Does the Public Affairs Office at Carswell produce its own photographs? Please indicate who does them.

66. Does the Public Affairs Office at Carswell conduct any public opinion surveys? Please explain.

67. How much of the copy for the base newspaper is generated by the Public Affairs Office personnel?
Activities (Question 56)

Base newspaper
Mass media liaison
Commander's call
Base-community council
Base tours
Open houses
Speeches
Programs to orient newly arrived personnel and their families
Information programs for wives
Personal letters from commanders to parents of airmen and young officers
Bulletin boards
Information center
Briefings
Reading racks
Posters
Hometown releases
Special projects
Base guides and yearbooks
Policy letters
Pamphlets
Fact sheets
Daily news digests
Other(s) not listed (please specify)
68. What is the average number of pages of the base newspaper?

69. Where is the base newspaper published?

70. Does the Public Affairs Office at Carswell do any contingency or disaster planning?

71. Does the Public Affairs Office at Carswell do much program planning, other than as a direct response to a particular problem situation? Please explain.

72. Does the Public Affairs Office at Carswell do speech writing? Please explain, including for whom speeches are written and who generates topics.

73. Trace the flow of a story. Include the generation of the idea, who writes the story, who must approve the story after it is written, how many people are authorized to make changes, and how much change is usually made.

74. Trace the flow of a speech.

75. Describe a typical day.

76. Do the public affairs programs utilized by the Carswell Public Affairs Office meet the special needs of the Air Force, as measured against criteria established by the Air Force? Please explain.

77. Do the internal communications utilized by the Carswell Public Affairs Office meet the special needs of the Air Force, as measured against criteria established by the Air Force? Please explain.

78. Do you think the criteria established by the Air Force for public affairs activities are realistic and adequate? Please explain.
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Air Force Public Affairs Organizational Chart
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Community Relations
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Resources and Projects

Security Review

major commands' public affairs offices
(MAC*, SAC*, TAC*, PACAF*, ATC*, AFLC*, etc.)

Wing
(base level)
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